

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 755 Case file # 95-HO-287616.

Material Examiner Malone (RO)

Remarks:

CRM - 14950

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: STEVE ROBERTSON

Area(s) of Expertise: HAIR AND FIBERS

Review commenced at: 7:45A (Time), 9/14/99 (Date)

File #: 95-287616

Laboratory #(s): 91004008

90524009

90413017

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
<u>RQ</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>XN</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: _____

Testimony Date(s): _____ Pages: _____

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 90413017 Date: MAY 10, 1989

Laboratory Number: 90524009 Date: JULY 25, 1989

Laboratory Number: 91004008 Date: DEC 28, 1989

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ AND UNKNOWN TECHNICIAN

Laboratory Number: 90413017

Laboratory Number: 90524009

Laboratory Number: 91004008

Page 1 of 4

Initials: SR

Was any other material reviewed? Yes No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: SUBMITTING AGENCY LETTER DATED
APRIL 11, 1989

Results of Review

File #: 95-287616 Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q26, K1-K5

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
 Yes No Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
 Yes No Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? Yes No Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? Yes No Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? Yes No Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 4

Initials SM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

#1. THE DOCUMENTATION IS INSUFFICIENT TO DETERMINE IF THE TESTS WERE PERFORMED IN A SCIENTIFICALLY ACCEPTABLE MANNER.

#2. THE RESULTS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY DOCUMENTED IN THE NOTES. THE NOTES ARE NOT DATED, MOST ARE IN PENCIL AND ARE NOT INITIALED BY THE TECHNICIAN. THE NUMBER OF HAIR AVAILABLE AND EXAMINED IS NOT DOCUMENTED. THE TECHNICIAN MAKES NO NOTATION THAT HAIR WAS OR WAS NOT RECOVERED AND MOUNTED FROM MOST ITEMS, ESPECIALLY Q7, WHILE THE EXAMINER NOTES DESCRIBE THE HAIR RECOVERED. THERE ARE SOME ERASURES IN THE NOTES.

A CONFIRMATION OF THE HAIR COMPARISON WAS APPARENTLY OBTAINED FROM ANOTHER QUALIFIED(?) EXAMINER, BUT THE CONFIRMATION SHEET DOES NOT SPECIFY WHICH 3 SPECIMENS WERE

Review completed at: 8:45AM (Time), 9/14/99 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 1 hour

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 4 pages.

Steve Roberts 9-14-99
(Signature) (Date)

Additional Comments
(Set forth by question #, if applicable)

File #: 95-287616

EXAMINED.
THE EXAMINER DID NOT REPORT THE PRESENCE OF HAIR
DIFFERENT THAN THE VICTIM AND SUSPECT FOUND ON Q7.